This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

3 2044 102 828 068

Urquhart

on the Italian War

73
33

HARVARD
LAW
LIBRARY
1859

73
33

26

2875

MR. URQUHART

ON

THE ITALIAN WAR.

14

c°7

SPEECH DELIVERED DURING ITS CONTINUANCE.

TO WHICH IS ADDED

A

MEMOIR ON EUROPE,

DRAWN UP FOR THE INSTRUCTION OF

THE PRESENT EMPEROR OF RUSSIA.

LONDON:
ROBERT HARDWICKE, 192, PICCADILLY.
1859.
Price One Shilling.

With this Address is published a Memoir by the Russian Cabinet. The designs and actions of Russia are here disclosed in words as undisguised as those of Mr. URQUHART, to which Europe has for so many years been deaf.

MR. URQUHART'S

ADDRESS

ON

NEUTRALITY.

ON Tuesday, the 17th of May, Mr. URQUHART resumed his adjourned address from the preceding Monday evening, at the Music Hall, Store-street. Mr. STOBART, of Newcastle, was called to the chair.

The CHAIRMAN said:—Ladies and Gentlemen,—In the absence of Mr. CRAWSHAY, the chairman of the Newcastle-upon-Tyne Committee, I have been requested, as secretary to that Committee, to take his place on the present occasion; but I do assure you I deem it a very high honour to preside over a meeting convened for the purpose of listening to a lecture from a man whom I believe in my heart and soul to be the greatest man of this age. (Applause). It is now upwards of four years since I first had the honour and the pleasure of meeting Mr. URQUHART. Like many others, I was then very much shocked by the statements he made respecting the position of our country, and I resolved, as an Englishman, to do my utmost, as far as my humble abilities and opportunities would admit me, to examine the facts in regard to the questions upon which he had spoken. I now come here to bear my humble but sincere testimony that, so far as I have examined those facts, I am obliged to come to the same conclusions that Mr. URQUHART has come to respecting the position of this country. (Applause.) I trust you will to-night give to Mr.

URQUHART a patient hearing. He may advance views on this question that may not harmonise with your own; but remember that if his views were all the same as yours, it would be unnecessary for him to speak. The position of this country reminds me of what SOCRATES said respecting friends. He said, "Of what use are a man's friends? If he is sick, he must employ a physician; and when he goes to law, he must find an advocate." That is very much the position of this country at this conjuncture. We must endeavour to obtain information from those who are able and willing to give information. (Hear, hear.) I believe in the intelligence, I believe in the sincerity, and I believe in the ability of Mr. URQUHART, and I do trust that you will give him a patient hearing on this occasion; and if there is any one present who wishes to put a relevant question, I am very sure that Mr. URQUHART will be happy to answer him. But, at the same time, I do trust that no one will interrupt this meeting by asking questions of an irrelevant character; and I trust that the meeting will support me in the position I now occupy, in maintaining the order of the meeting, so that its proceedings may be characterised by decorum; that we may assemble here to-night as the citizens of a common country desirous to know the facts on a given subject. I have much pleasure in introducing Mr. URQUHART to your attention.

Mr. CHARLES JONES.—Before Mr. URQUHART begins, I wish to make a statement. A few days ago an advertisement appeared in the newspapers for the enrolment of men to support the independence of Italy. The Committee of which I am a member wrote as follows to Mr. SOTHERON ESTCOURT:—

St. Pancras Foreign Affairs Committee, May 10, 1859.

SIR,—Iam directed to call your attention to the enclosed advertisement from the *Times* of this day, by which it appears that troops are being enrolled in this country to fight against one of her Majesty's allies, contrary to the Law of Nations, and the Foreign Enlistment Act.

This Committee deem it their duty to lose no time in informing you of this breach of neutrality, and hope to receive from you a speedy assurance of your intention to visit it with the penalties of the law.

This was the answer we received:—

Whitehall, May 18, 1859.

SIR,—I am directed by Mr. Secretary SOTHERON ESTCOURT to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 10th inst., enclosing an advertisement which appeared in the *Times* newspaper, headed "Guerra d'Independenza Italiana, Legione Montemerli."—I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

GATHORNE HARDY.

The proceeding to which this letter refers appears to be an offence against the laws of neutrality, and I wish to ask Mr. URQUHART to state his views on the subject.

Mr. URQUHART then rose, and was received with great applause. He said:—You are aware perhaps, or you may not be aware, and if not I tell you, that there have been formed throughout England associations for the protection, not of needlewomen, or of dumb animals, but of the subjects of her Majesty, by the enforcing of the laws of England. (Hear, hear.) These associations have sprung up in a soil that appeared the least congenial, namely, in that class of society from which have proceeded the most dangerous and alarming of agitations—the working men. They have been formed with a view of understanding how their country stands, of discovering the secret causes of action which produce events that are supposed to fall from the stars, and having found that these events depend chiefly upon human chicane, they are doing their best to save themselves and their country from the consequences. One of these associations, formed even in this Babel of tongues, the metropolis, has had this correspondence, and puts to me the question you have heard, but which I will repeat, as many of you have not heard it. The St. Pancras Committee brings to the knowledge of the Government the notification, by advertisement in the *Times*, of an association of men for robbery and murder, requiring to know what course the Government is going to take; the answer is an acknowledgment of the letter, but no indication of any intention on the part of the Government to do anything. It is true that the crimes proposed as the object of the enlistment are not to be

perpetrated on Blackheath, but in Italy. The character of the crimes is not, however, thereby altered, and prior knowledge in such a case constitutes the persons possessed of that knowledge, and taking no steps to arrest them, as themselves guilty. By an act of Parliament passed under George III., this species of crime has been provided for, and the Government, since the correspondence which has been read, has issued a proclamation declaring its intention to proceed against any persons violating the neutrality and laws of this country, by assisting the belligerents. It would seem, therefore, that the Home Secretary, in reply to the St. Pancras Committee, had failed only through inadvertence, or an official reserve, to announce the intentions of the Government, since the proclamation that so immediately followed could leave no doubt as to what those intentions were. But when we look more narrowly into the terms of that proclamation, an entirely new field is opened.

Mr. HARLOW (of Birmingham).—Before proceeding further, would you be good enough to explain the difference between lawful and unlawful wars. Without that it is not easy to apprehend the nature of the enlistment of soldiers in England to take part in a war in which England is not engaged, and how such an act as that becomes murder. (Cheers.)

Mr. URQUHART.—I suppose, from the attention that the question has met with from the audience, that I shall do right in following the question, and answering it at once. (Hear, hear.) And, indeed, there is no question which it is more requisite to put, and none which can involve a more solemn responsibility in answering. War is not, as you have been made to believe, a mere measure of state. War is the most solemn, as well as the most terrible, of all public tribunitial decisions. A war that is unjust is a crime multiplied by the number of individuals in the state that permits it. A war that is unlawful converts the whole state into a bandit and pirate community. A war that is just and necessary—for no war can be just that is not necessary—a war just and necessary

becomes lawful only when invested with the forms that belong to a judicial decision. Such a war is the preservation of the life of the community; but it is more, it is the preservation of the sense of justice amongst mankind, for if there were none to resist wrong there would be no right remaining upon earth. (Applause.) When, therefore, we efface the line which separates unjust from just war, when, above all things, we efface the line that separates lawful from unlawful war, we convert mankind, to use the words of a former statesman of England, into a society of wild beasts. (Hear, hear.) To render war just, to render it necessary, just, and lawful, the same conditions are requisite which are required for the punishment of a criminal at the Old Bailey. There must be the crime alleged, the evidence tendered, the verdict given, the sentence pronounced and lawfully executed. (Applause.) Unless every one of these conditions is fulfilled, the executioner, the sheriff, every officer there attendant, the witnesses, the judge, are all murderers in the eye of the laws of the country. The judge would be dragged from the bench and sent to prison to answer on his life, if he suffered the criminal who had been sentenced to be executed, except at the place and hour indica ted in the sentence If you have taken such precautions for the security of the life of every man, even though the man be a criminal, do you think that those forefathers of ours, who so carefully prepared this inheritance of protection for their children, could have neglected to surround with similar restraints the criminal passions of the nation in reference to its dealings with other communities, by which not individual lives, but the lives and conditions of millions of men, may be endangered. The sense of equity amongst them was so supreme, that they have placed a barrier alike to the caprice of monarchs, to the fickleness of mobs, to the influence of favourites, and the treachery of ministers. They have given to us private men, and to the meanest amongst us, the faculty of asserting those laws even against the highest heads. Forms must be observed for a war to be lawful, because,

without the observance of forms, foreign states do not know what you proceed upon, nor do your own subjects know what you are proceeding with. No man is permitted to draw the sword against his fellow-man except upon a declaration of war formally made. It requires but that a single grand jury should find a true bill for murder against any man engaged in any of our wars since 1838, to restore all that your Ministers have sold, all that your Parliaments have wasted, all that your people have given away, namely; the life and honour of this land, and with them its physical power and political supremacy. (Applause.) It requires but that one of those miscreants who constitute your armies to be brought before a tribunal of the land, and to be sentenced to be hanged by the neck till dead—even if the sentence be not carried into execution—to strike at the root of the evil. For, deprived of the miserable tools, the perfidious combinations of which you are the victims will be brought to naught. While this is the remedy, this is the only remedy—there are not two ways of dealing with crime. Your public policy is nothing but crime. Whilst you continue to think of these as something of a different kind, and not as what they are, you cannot recover from your present state, and you must go on from bad to worse. Let me ask you, who are assembled here, what you could do in any given case, such as you are at present? Could you influence the election of a single churchwarden? (Cries of "No, no.") Could you decide upon one single election of the 656 members of the House of Commons, itself a nullity? What interest, then, can I have in coming to address a body of men, who, as they stand, or sit here, are no more than so many sheep? My interest is not in what you are, but in what you may be made; for, good God! we have here more than fifty times enough to save England, if I can inspire one, two, three, or four, amongst you with the power which belongs to right-minded and honest men; if I can send these forth as apostles, amidst a degraded people, as beacons, amongst a benighted one. Then I may have some interest in addressing you, and it is in that

hope that lies this interest. I am proposing to you, in the midst of dangers about to overwhelm an existing community, the very process out of which all communities have taken their origin, namely; to form a code of laws for their government, which of course must begin by associations for their institution, only that here the laws exist although obscured, and remain in practice in individual cases, but have fallen into abeyance in respect to collective ones. But the law to which I refer is not only the law of England, it is also the law of nations, so called because it has been accepted by all, and that law comes down to modern times with the most precise enactments. It has been the pride of England to maintain it as the Romans did of old, and it is to that pride that she owes her honour and her power. I will now specify the conditions upon which alone, according to that law, a lawful war can be made. A grievance having been endured, the sufferer shall proceed to the adverse party and demand reparation. That reparation being refused, he shall present a second document, equally as essential, which is known by the name of an Ultimatum, and which indicates the consequence of refusing satisfaction. It is only after these two steps have been taken that comes the Declaration of War. That declaration of war, like the former steps, passes in Privy Council and is recorded in Chancery. Failing that record, no man can draw his weapon, except as a murderer or a pirate, for which he is liable to proceedings in the Central Criminal Court, as well as to be hung by the injured state. You know that if in a riot a soldier, not being himself attacked, should draw a weapon or fire a shot before the reading of the Riot Act by the civil magistrate, that soldier would be seized by the police and tried for murder, and moreover the officer who gave the order, as we had an instance in the Bristol riots, would be in like manner consigned to gaol to take his trial for participation before the event. That is exactly the case in regard to foreign wars: unless there is the declaration of war, which is the Riot Act of nations, the drawing of a weapon and shedding of blood is

as completely and absolutely murder, as it is murder in the streets if a soldier fired without the Riot Act being read, or if an individual rushed from a dark alley to stab another passing along.

Mr. J. T. HARLOWE.—How are the people to know whether a war made by our Government is legal or not legal?

Mr. URQUHART.—That question was perhaps superfluous after what I have stated. (Hear, hear.) But I am not sorry that it is put, because it is essential that this matter be worked out in every shape. I stated the other evening that public malversation is based on your ignorance, but, further, that there would be no necessity for knowledge if you were honest, for honesty alone protects a people. The question brings us back to this point. An honest nation is never in ignorance, for it will never permit that to be done for which it does not know the grounds, nor grounds to be taken which are not just. Now, I stated most emphatically that war became lawful, or rather had existence, only by *means of the declaration*. A war not declared, in the language of jurists, is "no war at all, but only pillage;" and in England, unless the proclamation of war has been made in Chancery, it is no war at all. I drew the distinction between just, necessary, and lawful wars—the lawfulness of war consisting in the lawfulness of execution. Suppose any one said to me, in the case of a man brought up for execution without being properly sentenced, Are we to interfere? If all were honest men in the country no man would lend a hand to an execution that had not received a lawful order; and if you countenanced a procession in the streets for the execution of a criminal not properly convicted, you would be guilty of murder. We have a case in point in the China war of 1838. A case arising out of that war came before the judges of the land. It was the case of Evans *v.* Hutton, an underwriters' case, in which the parties were secured against dangers from wars; damage was sustained, and those who suffered claimed compensation from the underwriters. This was refused on the ground that the damage did not proceed from war; and that plea was maintained by the

judges unanimously. They said this was no war, and you cannot plead the orders of Government; therefore, by the unanimous decision of the judges, the orders of Government sent in 1838 to China were for piracy. (Applause.) Now I think we may go to Italy; and, indeed, I may express at once my surprise and gratitude for the attention you have given me on what may appear an abstract point when minds are excited by unexpected and fearful events.

Mr. DEAN (of Manchester.)—We, the Manchester Foreign Affairs Committee, have looked upon this war as a blow to England through Austria. Is that so? And if so, will that be sufficient ground for England declaring war, after demanding satisfaction?

Mr. URQUHART.—The value of the question is this, What are we to do? That is a question in every man's mind, not here alone, but elsewhere and everywhere. What are we to do? Where do we stand? No one knows—no one can tell. This brings me back to the proclamation of neutrality. "He who enables my enemy," says VATTEL, "to do that which he himself could not do, is my enemy, and is at war with me." (Hear, hear.) The proclamation of neutrality is a bowl of hellebore administered to this land, and this people drains the cup and lies down upon its bed. (Cries of "No, no.") Why, there is not a man that you will meet throughout the streets but will tell you this country is neutral. (Cheers.)

Mr. SHAW (of Leeds.)—I wish to put a question for the information of those assembled here; it is to know something of the real state of affairs in reference to Italy. I have been very much puzzled indeed, of late, with much that has been said concerning the friends of Italy, and I think it very desirable that we should know who are the real friends of Italy, and when we know who are the real friends of Italy we shall want then to know whether England can stand neutral when wholesale murder is committed amongst the Italians by the Emperor of the FRENCH. (Applause.)

The CHAIRMAN.—I trust the gentleman will content himself with putting the question without observation, and allow Mr. URQUHART to proceed.

Mr. SHAW.—My question is simply this: The Emperor of FRANCE, having declared war against Austria (Cries of "Chair! Order!")—the Emperor of FRANCE having declared war against Austria, can England, seeing wholesale murder committed in that kind of way, stand neutral?

Mr. URQUHART.—I think that I shall answer the question in the course which I am now taking. I am going to show, not only that you are not neutral, and cannot be neutral, but that neutrality is falsely put forward to allay your fears for the time. There is no difficulty in showing this. The proclamation does not specify enlistment as one of the crimes against which the Government will proceed, and specifying other acts while accepting this one, which is the only one with which it has to deal, amounts to the encouragement of, and sanction to, the violation of neutrality. (Cheers.) Now, listen to the latest words of your two rulers, in and out of office. Mr. DISRAELI, having got rid of the Parliament for this slippery moment, addresses to his constituents far weightier words than he allows to drop in the House. He says, "Statesmen are not so able as they are supposed to be, and Russia is not so profound as is imagined." A Nemesis is supposed to pursue the shedding of man's blood, which forces the assassin to be his own accuser. Who had spoken of Russia in all this? Lord PALMERSTON wishes success to the "good cause." Lord PALMERSTON and Mr. DISRAELI are, therefore, both content with the present state of affairs, only Mr. DISRAELI wishes Russia to be more able. So your two substantive men being themselves agreed, are also agreed with Russia, with LOUIS NAPOLEON, and the Revolutionists, even by the confession of their own lips. These two substantive men are the only ones who are not trembling; sounds issuing from Sir J. PAKINGTON, Mr. GLADSTONE, Lord DERBY, and the rest, are nothing more than

loquacious perplexity. That which England will do is that which these two men have resolved that she shall do; and what they will resolve is easy to know, for it suffices to know what Russia desires. Lord PALMERSTON speaks of "the good cause." On Monday night I frightened you with the very sight of the Blue-books, though I only showed you one out of six; from that volume I read you three lines; and what did you learn by those three lines? you learned that Lord PALMERSTON had assassinated his "good cause." I then related what had occurred in reference to a speech of Mr. WHITESIDE in the House of Commons, when Lord PALMERSTON denied his own deed, and therefore you further learned from the three lines from the Blue-books that this Minister could lie and had lied to the House of Commons. What he had done he had done eleven years before, and nobody knew anything about it. It was printed, it is true, in the Blue-books, but nobody reads the Blue-books. You can cheer KOSSUTH, but you cannot take his advice when he gives you advice useful for you: he has done so once, and once only, when he said, "Gentlemen, read the Blue-books." When, after eleven years, Mr. WHITESIDE, to find weapons against a political opponent, plunges into the Blue-books and there makes this astounding discovery, does he come down to the House filled with horror, burning with indignation? does he announce the discovery he has made? does he say to the senate of the people, "Here is a poisoner in the garb of a physician administering arsenic to the patient? And you are busying yourselves about this or that symptom, instead of rescuing the unhappy victim out of his hands—that victim being not Italy only, but Italy through England?" Does he move the House that the noble Lord be sent to the Tower in the custody of the Black Rod, whilst articles of impeachment are being prepared against him? No; it is merely an injudicious exercise of discretion of which Lord PALMERSTON has been guilty. Lord PALMERSTON denies, and Mr. WHITESIDE lies like a turtle floundering on his back. (Laughter.) He

(Mr. WHITESIDE) reasserts next day that he has not been wrong; but who can recollect next day what has been said the day before. Thus Lord PALMERSTON has to be trusted in the words he has recently spoken on the authority of his previous acts; the difference is, that now he can avow what before he had to conceal. Mr. DISRAELI being, now at least, with him, no rational man can entertain a doubt as to England's part in this war. You have made Italy what she is; those who are engaged in making you do this, must disguise from you what you do. There can be no more conclusive evidence of the enrolment in that conspiracy than such an attempt, and this is the meaning of Mr. DISRAELI'S words in reference to statesmen being overrated. The talent of the dramatist consists in connecting secret passions with patent acts, and collecting in one focus an interest in diversified hazards running through various scenes, and so instituting a unity of action and thought out of a variety of acts and incidents. Such efforts are amongst the greatest of human genius, and have environed with splendour the names of a SOPHOCLES and a SHAKSPEARE. But a Minister, be he a guilty one or be he an incapable one, will adopt the process which is the reverse of this. He will, if he can, interrupt the sequence, destroy the unity, so as to disguise the relation of cause and effect, and for this no abler device can be devised than that of representing the actors as incapable. In a word, wherever you lift the trappings, as Russia's chariot is rolling on, you will find a sweating English Minister with his shoulder at the wheel. No wonder that that Minister, that any Minister, should try to pull them down again. But Mr. DISRAELI has a colleague—a colleague of great ingenuousness and promise: he occupies the important trust of Foreign Secretary. Lord MALMESBURY is grandson of Sir JAMES HARRIS, one of England's best diplomatists even then, and a very poor creature. (Laughter.) Lord MALMESBURY is become an historian by compiling the Memoirs of his grandfather. In those Memoirs he has announced the maxim of

Russian policy, which covers the whole case of Italy at the present moment. Excusing the conduct of his grandfather, he says, "He had to meet the wiles of an empress who sought to involve England and France in a hot war while she pursued her intrigues in the East." (Cheers.) Yes, to involve England and France in a hot war, that is what Russia seeks, and has sought during every moment of time, which she has already thrice accomplished, which she is now about to accomplish for the fourth time; which fourth time, in my judgment now, as repeatedly expressed in anticipation during the last five-and-twenty years, will bring her into the fruition of results, towards which hitherto she has only made advances. But the present contingency arises not now; it commenced when you sent your troops to the Crimea, when I wrote and published these words: (I had just before said that the army you sent would never return)—"It matters not whether this army returns or not, or others are sent out, or whether this war is interrupted, or continued, or carried on elsewhere, Russia has now got Europe between the upper and the nether millstone, and will not suffer her to escape till she is ground to dust." (Hear, hear.) The disease was then established; it was the hot fit, the Crimea; the cold fit, the Conferences of Paris: another hot fit in India and China; another cold fit now of neutrality; and so on, till anything will be acceptable so you but escape from yourselves. It is in no presumptuous spirit that I refer back to my own predictions, or that I say that I foretold everything—everything that has been and can be done with you—because there is no difficulty in doing so, and yet I purposely put on the appearance of presumption, because the only thing I can do for you is to arouse your hatred against myself. If I can get you to hate me, I can get you to exert yourselves to refute me; and I know and have found no other means by which to make you make that effort; the only thing about you not inert is your evil passions. Amongst a generation so despicable as this, what may not be done? To manage one fool is not a difficult task, how easy must it be to

manage twenty-seven millions of fools. Fools who are endowed with faculties to find reasons for everything about which they know nothing; who read every day their newspaper, and who have nothing in life so much at heart as to discover that nothing is wrong, because they have sense enough left at least to know that they are incapable of setting anything right; who, besides all this, are a free people, so that their self-love is all alert to discover that whatever happens is their own doing. If I were to suppose that it required any amount of ability to anticipate what could be done with so despicable a race, it would be to insult my own understanding. But I do not stand alone; there are twenty men, or nearly twenty men, still, or but recently, alive, who could, if they had chosen, have told you all I have told you. I refer, of course, to diplomatic men, for those only who are engaged in the mystery can reveal the secret; but they did not choose to tell you, for two reasons: the first, that it would interfere with their advancement, or deprive them of their bread; the second, that they considered the case of England desperate: "The people sheep, and the rulers wolves."* They say, and have said, in private, what I have said publicly: "There is no wrong that the English people will not endure; there is no crime they will not perpetrate."

A Voice—You are wrong.

Mr. Urquhart—Wrong is a healthy word; I am happy to hear it, but he who uses it should be able to maintain it. (Cheers.) I do not ask the gentleman who uttered it to come up to this platform to maintain it, because I learn from his countenance that he is unequal to the task; therefore, dealing with it as a vague and unmeaning dissent, I will dwell on the point for a moment to render it unmistakable. I say that you are wrong, and have always been wrong in whatever you believe, at fault in whatever you expect, and sure to be in the contrary opinion to-morrow of that which you are to-day, and that not in foreign events only,

* Words of Lord Ponsonby.

but in domestic affairs, in everything great and small. Let us take the most important. When you carried the Corn Laws, did you not expect to have cheap bread? (Hear, hear.) When you reformed the Parliament, did you expect double taxes? (Cheers.) When the Parliament that had condemned an act of piracy at Canton was sent back to its constituents, did it expect to be turned out of doors? Now what is to be done for a people, or with a people, that is always wrong—that is as certain to be in error as it is to speak, and to cut its own throat as to act? You cannot send a nation to a nursery, but you may send it to school: it has got to learn, and, in your case, to unlearn—that is, to study. It has to drop leaders, and take to public documents, and to give up newspapers for the book of the laws. There is one thing of which I am proud; it happened at the very beginning of my course: it is the answer I gave to the question when first put to me by a minister or a sovereign: "What is to be done?" That question proceeded from your late sovereign, William IV. I did not answer by any plan or project. I did not propose any activity of limb to ensure the paralysis of the brain; but I said, "England can only be saved by going to the expenditure of 300*l.* a year in salaries to six clerks, that they may study diplomacy." When asked why I fixed so many or so few, I replied, "If you have but one or two heads in a whole land they will most assuredly become traitors, for having no one to control them when they are wrong, and no backing when they are right, they will most assuredly fall before the wiles, the pressure, and temptations of foreign influence; each one added to the number of the conscious will increase the difficulty or the danger of treachery. I place six as the lowest upon which you can reckon." These words were uttered, if I mistake not, in the year 1831. Here let me observe that you think yourselves secure because of the number of persons who form the Cabinet. Do not misunderstand what I say. Do not suppose that the Cabinet collectively is informed. In each case the only

acting man is the conscious man, and that man is Russia's man. The other members of the Cabinet know no more than the Parliament or the nation; or rather they know less, because upon them, when necessary, means of deception are directly used of which the others feel only the effects. Mr. LABOUCHERE said he knew no more about the opening of letters at the Post Office than any other member of the House of Commons. If this is the case as regards a domestic affair, and one almost of publicity, what can they know about foreign affairs? Amongst the documents found in the cabinet of LOUIS PHILIPPE in 1848, and published in Paris, there are letters of M. GUIZOT, in which he speaks of its not being Lord PALMERSTON'S habit to communicate his despatches to his colleagues except when he wanted to make use of a Cabinet decision, which of course he could, under such conditions, always get when he wanted. The same was publicly declared in the French Chambers, in October, 1840. The QUEEN herself has informed us that she is made a party to acts without her knowledge, by despatches being altered after she had seen them. It is not, then, cabinet after cabinet that is compromised, but only individual ministers. I myself, from circumstances in which I have been concerned, can tell you that, in matters of real moment, the colleagues of the Foreign Secretary are in as utter ignorance of what is being done as you are. You may suppose that when I gave the answer about the six clerks I had but little experience to guide me : with the exception of Poland none of the disastrous events that have constituted subsequent history had commenced to run their course. But yet, even then I knew just as much as I know to-day, that was that England had to be saved, and that without the adoption of measures of prevention her fall was inevitable. But the measure whch I proposed for rescuing England was no other than the method employed by Russia for destroying England, and elevating her own power on the ruins of England. Russia does not commit her high offices of state to the men of wealth or influence, to the nobles of

her land, to the leaders of faction, or mob demagogues. She selects them from amongst strangers, or takes them from the Foundling Hospital, causing them to pass through a long and elaborate course of study, and thus, being able to send to each country one man cleverer than any man in that country, she marches securely towards the subjugation of the human race. Now, as you would not take my advice, and form betimes men fit to save you in your day of trouble, I will give you another piece of advice. Take an attaché from any Russian embassy, purchase his honesty for a good sum, make him your Premier, and I will answer for it that even although you cannot recal the past, at least every danger will vanish for the future. You will come out even from the dead thraw of this neutrality, and turn upon Russia herself all the weapons with which she threatens you. I said on Monday night that diplomacy was a science that could only be acquired and practised as all other sciences. The words called forth a laugh, and I may observe to the members of the press that that was the only laugh on Monday night. I have often used the same expression in addressing meetings in the provinces. It has never failed to go home to those men's minds, and to carry conviction. In fact, it is upon this sentence that the Foreign Affairs Associations have been formed. Converting the prevailing sense of perplexity into the consciousness of ignorance as its origin, it opened the hope of escaping from the one by removing the other. But this was an impulse of honest minds. Never came so fearfully upon me, as by that laugh on Monday night, the worthlessness and the vacancy of a metropolitan audience. (Cheers.) I am now going to give you other words of KOSSUTH, but these were not spoken to the English nation:— "The events of 1848 prove that in every Cabinet Russia has had her spy; it is not too much to say, her agent." By means of these scientifically educated diplomatists, of whom I was speaking, Russia has a man placed behind each throne; at the elbow of each Minister; the confidant of every faction; the organiser of every conspiracy,

and the patron of every scheme of convulsion. Nay, more, it is she who holds the door to Ministerial office. In some countries she normally practises dethronement of monarchs, as in others dissolution of Parliaments. Her business is with the vices of men, and wherever she finds a promising germ she cultivates it, and transplants it. A Testator has been hurried out of the world. Is not the man who has shortened his life a man to make a King of for some independent country? If another be compromised in bill transactions, how admirable as a Chancellor of the Exchequer for one of her allies! Should a Prince, with due qualifications of station, be party to the forgery of 10,000*l.* of Exchequer bonds, for him it would be worth erecting a throne. A man of family has cogged dice, and lies in consequence under the sentence of a jury. Would not this be a man to have sent as a foreign representative to the Court of St. Petersburg? Whoever is a villain is known to Russia, and brought forward by her, and, so bound to her, not one dares to lift a finger or to disobey a mandate. I can tell you that LOUIS NAPOLEON'S tenure of the office, which he holds under her, of Emperor of the French, would not have been worth a week's purchase had he refused to send his army to the Crimea, or were he now to hesitate when told that "the time was come" to go to Genoa. The leading journal said, in 1848, "Europe is governed by colonels in Russian uniforms." But Europe is governed by men whose secrets lie in the palm of Russia's hand, and thus has it become a chaos, but a chaos moved by springs, the wires of which all lead to St. Petersburg. However, through the variety of combinations and multiplicity of ends, this purpose comes out the leading one, in which all other aims are centred, and to which all other means tend, and it is this, to place in each country the whole power in the hands of one man, and then she rules the country through that man, and rules the man through the country. For a country reduced to this condition it is always in her power to move. She has finally attained to this position in three

of the European states, and these are France, England, and Sardinia. I have entered into this digression in illustration of that one point of my argument, namely, that Lord PALMERSTON and Mr. DISRAELI can only intend what Russia desires, and that what she desires is the inter-destruction of the European kingdoms by one another. And I will close this digression by quoting, for your instruction, the words of warning which NAPOLEON gave utterance to from St. Helena, when he announced that Russia would come into possession of the fairest provinces of the South, and that by fanning discords into flame and rivalries into war; whilst she, backed by the pole, uncompromised and unendangered, threw the weight of her supernumerary armies into the one or the other scale, as the one or the other chanced to preponderate, so as to balance fortune and render the combat interminable, until it terminated in common prostration and universal submission. Nevertheless, Russia fears you. You and she stand alike in fear; you dreading destruction, she dreading that you will be awakened. On Monday night I drew for you the picture of the contrast of England in 1854 and England in 1859. I showed you that the former was one of splendour contrasted with the present one. I told you that then you had an army to defend your shores, a navy to command the ocean, an India secured by the unbroken tenure of a hundred years, and a Sepoy army of unshaken loyalty and undoubted courage, securing you at once the possession of that Eastern empire, and at the same time your power in Europe and your dignity in the world. Between 1854 and 1859 you have played all these things away. You are now powerless abroad, utterly defenceless at home, at any moment liable to be involved in a struggle for existence in India by the interposition of a foreign state, and you may be injured and insulted with impunity by any third-rate power in Europe, having descended to a lower grade than that third-rate power as far as material means are concerned; whilst you have all the charges and weight to support of an empire of

the first order, are possessed of wealth to excite the cupidity of the globe, and have lived a life of atrocity and crime such as to arouse against you universal hostility and hatred. And this every man who walks the streets feels if he does not know. The cry for neutrality is the shriek of fear. Fear itself may be an inspiring genius, it is from despair that often safety springs But your fear is panic, for it is the offspring of perplexity. You have not yourselves to fall back upon; you can say no more than this: With whom shall we take part? Shall we join France—shall we join Austria? Meanwhile, you know that you cannot support a war; that a war for you is commercial bankruptcy within, invasion and dismemberment from abroad, and so your refuge is neutrality, which, in other words, is waiting for the time to have your throats cut. (Hear, hear.) If you possessed that power which you held in 1854, then you might speak of neutrality as a thing of your will, because you would then have had the means of maintaining it; but if you did possess those means, you would be now, as then, frantically shrieking for war, and crying out, as you did in reference to the Turkish war, "This fighting must be put down." If you had thought of yourselves, and not of others, of what your duties were, not what were the acts of other people, you would know that the public constitution of Europe is based upon a common treaty, of which you are at once a party and guarantee; and then you would fear France breaking down that compact, without the shadow of a pretext to give her even a standing-ground in court; the instantaneous resolution of the land would be, not indeed to join Austria, but to manacle France; but I am supposing the case of rational men. You would then proceed to consider how this was to be done; having considered, you would have ascertained that it proceeded from no French design, that it was no settled, though insane, purpose of the French mind, but that that country was acting merely as the tool of Russia. Passing by, therefore, the subordinates, the instruments, you would go at once

to the source, the head, and grapple Russia herself; then the difficulty would at once disappear. Reducing Russia to that condition of serfdom to England, which results from physical and geographical causes, you would use her to reduce France, or any other country that pretended to disturb the public tranquillity. But how gain that mastery over Russia? Nothing more easy; only that your Ministers are her tools. COBDEN has said one true word, the only true word he has spoken—(a laugh)—and for that word you laughed at him. He told you that you could crumple up Russia. I tell you that Russia is crumpled up from the moment that you have a Minister who would dare to whisper in the ear of the Russian Minister the word "Privateers." But the uttering of that word involves two conditions. First, the reversal of the Declaration of Paris regarding maritime rights; the second, that this imaginary British Minister should take precautions against assassination. The meaning to Russia of the word "Privateers," so uttered, is this: that England declaring war against Russia—I mean not the hoax that you have lately seen, but a real war—and resuming again her natural rights—the natural rights of all nations—the fate that would attend a Russian emperor, who did not make to England the satisfaction she required, would be the fate of PAUL, namely, the Cossack sash and boot-heel. (Cheers.) And this result England could obtain without moving a regiment or detaching a single vessel of war from her own shores. Twenty letters of marque would do the whole thing—twenty privateers to intercept her commerce from the two outlets through which it must pass. This is the reason why Russia fears you quite as much as you fear her—only her fear is a calculation of prudence, your fear a shriek of agony. Nations do not perish from circumstances which you call facts: they perish only through sentences, or, rather, words. If foolish words obtain currency, the nation becomes foolish, and then it destroys itself; whilst sense is retained, circumstances, however disastrous, only supply energy; ruin comes from foolish words being substituted for things and

disseminated from mouth to ear, or printed on paper and spread before the eyes. This takes the sense of a nation out of it, no men are left any longer in it; and this is what CHANNING means when he says: "The nation is the tomb of the man." In any attempt to trace the downfal of a people we have got to follow its speech, and to see therein the process by which it is made to misunderstand the question at issue. In each case you will find the story of the Sphynx repeated. There will always be a magician saying to the Bœotians: "Expound my riddle, or I will eat you up." How much more, then, in any attempt to save a people, is an ŒDIPUS required to discover the man in the beast. The riddle propounded to us just now is neutrality. The first thing, then, that we have to do is to get the word on the table, then hammer it and see what it is made of. Neutrality comes from neuter. Neuter means neither, and is applied to sex. A neutral being is one that is neither a man nor a woman—(laughter)—a neutral being has no sex, no station in law, and can have no progeny. It is familiarly known by the word mule. Now what is a neutral nation? and what is a nation that takes to neutralising itself? That is the worst that an enemy could do for it. A neutral nation is a nothing at all, or less than a nothing at all, it is a nation that commits suicide. You were greatly proud, some time ago, of neutralising the Black Sea; that process consisted in destroying the maritime means of offence and defence of your ally Turkey; it did not interfere, even by Lord PALMERSTON'S avowal, with Russia's attacking Circassia, and, all the while, the neutralising the Black Sea was intended to convey that the Russian fleet there was to be a nonentity. Well, see what presently comes out of it; Russia, extinguished in the Black Sea, comes out at Villafranca (hear, hear), and having come out at Villafranca, LOUIS NAPOLEON comes to Genoa, and Europe is plunged in war. Here is your fine performance in the Crimea! England, with all her power—France, with all her power—Sardinia, too, with all her power—come to back Turkey,

who had already beaten Russia before you appeared (cheers), and these four states obtain, as the result of their efforts, the neutralisation of the Black Sea and the convulsion of the world. Now is it not the riddle contained in the word neutralisation that prevented you from understanding the matter at issue, and so brought upon you past disasters, present fear and trouble, and future ruin? If Count CAVOUR were not a Russian, would a Sardinian port be given up, in peace, to be converted into a Russian arsenal? If LOUIS NAPOLEON were not a Russian, must not a declaration of war against Sardinia have instantly followed upon the announcement that a Russian arsenal was established on the limits of France, by her connivance? If the English Government were not Russian, would not, the day after the arrival of the intelligence, at least an order have been despatched to withdraw the representatives of England from the courts of Turin and St. Petersburg? The whole is a conspiracy, not only patent, but avowed and proclaimed, against Europe, between the Russian cabinet and the cabinets of Europe. (Cheers.) Look to what is looming in the future. Who is Sardinia's King? Why is this Savoy Prince called King of Sardinia? Because he was King of Cyprus. He is made a European potentate only because he is the King of Cyprus. But who does Cyprus belong to? Is it not part of the Ottoman Empire? But he is more than King of Cyprus; he is King of Jerusalem. (A laugh.) Did you know he was King of Jerusalem and not of Sardinia? One thing you do know, that Russia is seeking the inheritance of "the Sick Man." Cyprus and Jerusalem are part of the intestines of the sick man; they are his flesh and bone; and the King of Sardinia is King of Cyprus and Jerusalem; and the King of Sardinia gives up to Russia his possessions by private contract.

Mr. JONES (the East Indian Proprietor).—I wish to ask whether Sardinia is under submission in any way, or holds any allegiance, to the Ottoman Porte."

Mr. URQUHART.—I do not think the question bears exactly

upon the subject under consideration. The Savoy pretensions belong to the period of the Crusades, and therefore precede the establishment of the Ottoman Empire. Now you see the connexion of Russia with the affairs of Italy. You will find all this settled in 1816. You will find the representative of Russia, a MONCENIGO, propounding at Milan the "Unita d'Italia" against her own Treaty of Vienna.

A WORKING MAN in the Hall asked—What are the best means of intercepting the policy of Russia?

The CHAIRMAN.—Mr. URQUHART will come to that soon.

Mr. URQUHART—If you put the question to me, what I would do as a Minister of England, that is one thing; but to ask me what I would do as a private individual, is another thing. In the first position there is no difficulty in the matter, but in the second it is the most desperate enterprise ever undertaken by man. If I were Minister I should have nothing to do; the fact alone would do everything. If any honest man were Minister, however small his knowledge, up to the present time the arbitration of everything would be in his hands. It requires only to deal with the case as an honest man must do—judicially. First, he would have to abrogate every act of conspiracy; that is to say, every treaty not according to the law of nations. He would have to apply himself to fulfilling every treaty fulfilling those conditions. Above all, he would have to abrogate the infamous Declaration at the Congress of Paris, by which it is pretended to abrogate the natural and necessary rights of a belligerent power. The consequence of this would be, that he would withdraw the support of England from Russia. And as Russia's preponderance has not yet been practically assured, but only fictitiously attained, that alone would suffice to change the whole face of things. Cardinal GONSALVI has said: "Such is the eminence Russia has obtained, and by such means, that her vigilance dare not slumber for a single day." But her vigilance is of no account the moment the indifference of another state is vanquished so as to do its duty. Now,

as I am about to refer to particular states, do not mistake me in what I shall say of Austria as being actuated by passions such as those which move you whenever you deal with political matters. Be assured, then, that I have no affection for Austria. If there is a state that deserves the abhorrence of mankind it is Austria. If there is a government that deserves to fail in every plan and be defeated in every enterprise, it is Austria. If there is a government which merits neither the fear of foes nor the affections of friends, it is Austria. Austria in public life resembles the weak man in private life, who will not grasp the dagger himself, but will not wrench it out of the assassin's hand; who is destitute alike of the courage of the villain and of the integrity of the just man. With any self-respect, could an Austrian gentleman sit in conclave at the same table with a CAVOUR: could Austria send her troops to occupy the provinces which the servants of the SULTAN had restored to their master? Why are we met here to-night? For two reasons. The first, because Austria has not the meanness to be Russia's accomplice; the second, that she has not the faculty to be her antagonist. If Austria did her duty there would be no Italian war to-day, as there would have been no interruption of the public tranquillity for the last quarter of a century. (Hear, hear.) A Russian ambassador has said, in one of those priceless secret despatches, that with a Cabinet composed like the Imperial Cabinet, meaning that of Russia, it would always be easy to reduce to obedience to circumstances, a cabinet so composed as the Cabinet of Vienna. But Austria, black as she is, is of vestal purity compared with you—you who are ready to handle the assassin's dagger, and have neither the compunctions of a weak mind nor the profits of the strong. An honest Minister of England in dealing with this case would not so much as understand your notion of taking part with Austria. In dealing with the pirate LOUIS NAPOLEON, he would deal with him on English, not Austrian grounds; he would be swayed by none of

your sense of powerlessness, nor so much as think of the army which you no longer have. So, taking his stand, he would require from Austria to do her duty. And this would be no difficult task. Do you know why Austria and why Prussia did not take part in your late pretended war against Russia? It was because they knew that it was a false war From the moment that England and France signed the protocol to the effect that the war about to be undertaken should not alter the territorial limitations of the two empires, Russia and Turkey—meaning that that war should not effect, but prevent, the resuscitation of the countries she had extinguished, and the restoration to their rightful owners of the territories she had robbed—the two German Powers refused all participation. The case was put in this form by the Minister of Prussia:—"If you have predetermined that your war against Russia is to leave her in the position of menace against us, which she at present holds, how can you expect us to take part in it?" A Prussian Representative wrote to a friend in England, at the beginning of the war:—"Everybody here is with you as far as being against Russia, but people doubt whether you are with yourselves." So much for Prussia and Austria. Austria went further. She had a special ground of objection against your war, and that was to the expedition to the Crimea. Not choosing to be a party to a war which was not to diminish the power of Russia, she specially objected to that war, when it was to be made to consist of an attack upon the only unassailable point of her whole territory. Lord RAGLAN had a plan laid before me. I considered the matter so delicate—and there are those here present who are aware—that I abstained from writing in the press for a considerable time, that my words should not be biassed by what I knew of the purpose. My views were submitted at length in the Ordnance Office, and one of those present afterwards said to me, "There is no word you said that has not proved true." One of the plans discussed was the invasion of the

Crimea, and my remark was this: "If Russia had sent down some body to advise an undertaking, that operation would have been recommended." The plan was abandoned from that time, and only reverted to some months afterwards, at the instigation of Lord PALMERSTON, who refused to give his reasons. Had you impinged upon Russia anywhere else you would have called the populations to arms, and encircled her with a flame of insurrection from beyond the Caspian to the Northern Sea. (Cheers.) 'An honest Minister of England would, therefore, leave aside France, and Sardinia, and Italy, and deal with Russia. Dealing with Russia he would restore France to sense and repose; call Prussia and Austria to his side, muster in lieu of the lost armies of England the warlike populations of the Ottoman Empire, and the bond and signal of this confederacy of mankind to maintain peace and the laws would be the restoration of Poland. (Prolonged cheering.) But I am not Minister of England, and you are not going to have an honest man Minister. What, then, remains for me to do? What I am doing at this moment. I must continue, as heretofore, to tell you what you are, and, as hitherto I have endeavoured to shake your confidence, now must I endeavour to dispel your perplexity. Having had, up to the present moment, to struggle with your passions, I have now to struggle with your fears. I have to close to-night where I commenced on Monday night last, enacting the maxim left us by one of the men when we had statesmen: "If you cannot save your country, drop not your protest against the men and the measures by which she is ruined." I say to you, read the Blue-books; study the Blue-books; come to us, who are engaged in their perusal and in their study. You have been taught and you have learnt the ready lesson, that something else is potential in worldly affairs, and not truth and justice. Come to our schools, and you will learn the contrary; you will learn it by experience even in your own hearts and in your own faculties. It is no fable that Sodom and Gomorrah might have been saved if they had

contained within their walls ten just men. I cannot so much as comprehend how a state, containing but a single honest man, should perish. Come to us, and study with us to be honest; for, unless we can make honest men in the land, how shall we have an honest Minister. And it is because things are brought to this pass, that there remains no other means by which this empire can be rescued from perdition, save an honest Minister, and, such person not existing, and having to be made, that we, by that necessity out of which all states and empires have necessarily sprung, have formed an Association for the Protection of England and the Maintenance of her Laws.

Mr. URQUHART then concluded an address, which lasted nearly three hours, amidst prolonged cheering.

Mr. ROLLAND.—I will not detain you one moment at this late hour in proposing a vote of thanks to Mr. URQUHART, but will say, simply as a conclusion and an addition to those words of fire that you have heard from him this evening—let all those who wish to carry the matter further, meet in the adjoining room. Some there must be who will not let the matter drop. All can do much. There is not a man who cannot do something. When last I stood in Store-street Hall, it was five years ago, Mr. URQUHART was then alone. Now he can number some thousands of instructed men. (Cheers.) I beg to move a vote of thanks to Mr. URQUHART for his address.

Mr. DEAN, of Manchester, seconded the motion, which was then carried by acclamation. The meeting then separated.

APPENDIX.

MEMOIR ON RUSSIA, FOR THE INSTRUCTION OF THE PRESENT EMPEROR.

DRAWN UP BY THE CABINET IN 1837.

THIS document, which came within reach of the public in consequence of a Prussian ministerial crisis, is one of the most remarkable state papers that has ever seen the light. We present it to our readers in a condensed form, except where inverted commas mark that the very words of the original are given. It begins by describing the character of the Russian race, and by deducing from it the extraordinary development of the Empire. The Russian people, it says, is worthy to prescribe law to Europe, for as early as the reigns of IVAN III. and IV., the nobles manifested their patriotism by resigning their political privileges into the hands of the CZAR; and the result of their self-sacrifice was that Russia could direct her whole strength against the foreigner without being distracted by a turbulent nobility, such as that which ruined Sweden and Poland. The last dangerous crisis she had to go through was caused by the pseudo-DEMETRIUS; since which period she has carried her victorious arms into every neighbouring country, and has reclaimed from Poland what she had temporarily ceded to it in the time of her internal struggle. "It was lent money, and has returned a thousand per cent."

"PETER gave life and soul to our system. He did away with the powers of the Senate, and declared that its consent was unnecessary to confer validity on his ukases; and he abolished the dignity of Patriarch, which he found to be injurious to the strength of his government." He was the founder of our fleet, which is "destined to perform great things in a not distant future," and it was he who perceived that the acquisition of the Swedish provinces on the Baltic was necessary to Russia on account of their ports and trade. In the acquisition of them he made use of Poland and Denmark. At the same time he obtained sway over the Caspian Sea, in spite of the Persians; and, although the Porte was twice on the point of attacking us on that account, war was prevented by France, who mediated in favour of Russia, and to the injury of her old ally.

"The short-sighted may accuse the father of abandoning human feelings when he put his son to death. But in our eyes it is only a proof of the greatness of PETER, and of the height to which he was elevated above the prejudices of the vulgar. The father sacrificed to the sovereign whatever is highest in family life; his Russians appreciated the superhuman deed, and in later times, inflamed by an enthusiastic love of their great fatherland, more than once sacrificed *similar hostile elements* to the benefit of their country."

There was great practical wisdom in the abolition of primogeniture and hereditary succession in general. The genius of PETER continued

to rule under CATHERINE I. In the reign of ANNE the pride of the old families once more burst into a flame, but only to be extinguished in such a manner that it should no more interfere with the autocracy of the Emperor. For some time there were no foreign acquisitions, because the country had to gather strength within. "It does not agree with a cautious policy to tear large districts from consolidated states, with totally different institutions and religions, particularly if there is time to carry on the annexation leisurely. Moreover, smaller portions are more easily assimilated. At all events, it appears more expedient to let the countries destined to be acquired, exist for some time under separate but thoroughly dependent and subject chiefs, as we have done in Moldavia, Wallachia, and Servia."

The dismemberment of Poland was indispensable, because it was the business of Russia to advance towards the West, and "to establish all the Slavonic tribes, without exception, in one great mansion." Poland being not an hereditary monarchy, but an aristocratic confederation—or, to speak more correctly, a turbulent democracy of nobles, which included a great variety of nationalities—its fate, when brought into contact with a great centralised neighbour, could not be doubtful.

"From loosely connected Germany no successful resistance was, or is, to be feared; there was the form of an empire, but hollow, without spirit and without life. As to France, she had no right to resist the partition of Poland; for Russia merely acted upon the maxims so effectually applied since 1552 by France to Germany. In the life of nations and states historical consequences must prevail, because they are a necessary produce of power. The destiny of Poland with respect to Russia was first to protect the giant from the West while in his cradle, then to exercise him in the use of arms, and lastly to return into that great bond which is destined to embrace all Slavonic tribes." There can be but one Slavonic empire, and that must be Russia.

After the demise of the crown of Poland, and when France, very much to our satisfaction, had started STANISLAUS LESCZINSKI as a candidate, our problem was to conclude an alliance with some powerful intermediate state, with a view of making it bear the greater part of the burden and expenses of war. This state was Austria; and we succeeded in setting her to work for our ends. Under the appearance and pretence of guarding the rights of the Dissidents, a Russian army entered Poland; the final result being, that the weak German Empire indemnified LESCZINSKI by the cession of Lorraine, which was afterwards to go to France. Sweden was powerless, her demoralised nobility being in the pay either of Russia or of France. The Porte alone saw clearly, and attempted to occupy the growing power of Russia by the Tartars of the Crimea. For this she was "chastised" afterwards, Austria being bound by treaty to help in the business. "Our whole army fought like one hero; everywhere the Crescent waned before the vigour of our arms; and had the achievements of Austria in any way been commensurate to ours, the Mussulman empire in Europe would at that time have come to an

end. But the Austrian army, which seldom has the good fortune to produce a great captain, covered itself with disgrace, under five successive generals, and during three campaigns, and finally crowned its ignominy by the separate peace of Belgrade. Russia consented to the peace only in order to have her hands free to chastise Sweden, which state had to pay for the temporary supremacy of the French party by abjectly supplicating for peace, by loss of territory, and by electing, at the order of the Empress ELIZABETH, the Duke ADOLPH FREDERICK OF HOLSTEIN, as Crown Prince."

During the war of the Austrian succession, Russia left the contending parties to exhaust themselves. It was not until negotiations for peace had been set on foot that she sent soldiers into Germany, and accelerated the conclusion of the peace of Aix-la-Chapelle. "The alliance with Austria against FREDERICK II. of Prussia, with a view to dismember this latter state, was entirely in keeping with the tendency of our policy. As we could not allow an independent Poland to exist, so we could not suffer the formation of a power on the eastern frontier of Germany capable of retarding our entrance into that country, even for so short a period as to give the other states time to arm. France never suffered such a power to grow up on her confines, and owing to this policy, she was always able to carry war into the heart of the German Empire, and to force the occupied provinces first to remain inactive, and then to bear the burden of the war, and to pay her an indemnity. Such is the secret of the preponderance she exercised for more than one hundred years over the German states. To us the partition of Prussia was the more necessary, as we might find her opposed to our views on Poland. In spite of the genius of her Ruler, we should at that time have crushed Prussia, and rendered her innocuous for ever, if the Empress ELIZABETH had lived a twelvemonth longer. But PETER OF HOLSTEIN was blind to the grandeur of our national policy, and concluded a treaty of peace and defensive alliance with the Prussian King. He paid to the genius of our country the same penalty as ALEXIS, the son of the Great PETER."

"Unfortunately the Prussian state continued to exist during the reign of CATHERINE II.; but nothing proved so much the irresistible power of our diplomacy and position as the fact that FREDERICK II., otherwise so prudent a politician, remained always subservient to our policy, even when the interests of his kingdom required the contrary." FREDERICK had learned by experience how easy it was for the Russian armies to penetrate into Prussia; and to remedy this disadvantage, he entered upon the partition of Poland; but, by doing so, he afforded to us a compensation for our misadventure in not having partitioned his own country. In Poland, after the death of AUGUSTUS, Russia had to restore order, and, apparently, to maintain the rights of the Dissidents against the Roman Catholic bishops, without, however, interfering effectually with the power of these latter to persecute other denominations. The main point was that a Russian army was planted in Poland, and that the Polish constitution was

altered in a manner suitable to our purposes. At that time, too, the Porte alone took the right view in standing up for Poland. But the Turkish armies were defeated; the Russian fleet met with no obstacle on its way to the Mediterranean,* and gained a victory. "The Cabinet of Vienna concluded an alliance with Turkey, and advanced an army towards the frontiers of Moldavia. But, to make up for that, Prussia was our guard, to keep Austria in check. Besides, our Empress disposed of a more effective means to quiet Austria—namely, Poland. It was deplorable, indeed, that brothers of our race should fall under the rule of German princes; but our cautious policy found itself at that time constrained to yield to the necessity of circumstances. The fault of not having dismembered Prussia *had been committed*, and that state now opposed a serious obstacle in the way of our acquiring at once the whole of Poland. Austria, France, England, Holland, and Sweden were not more disposed to approve of our annexation of that country; a coalition of all these powers was to be feared; and Turkey was already under arms. The complete execution of our plan was thus for the time rendered impossible; but renounce it we could not, because it was only by the closest possible contact with the German states, that we could hope firmly to establish and advantageously to use our influence and preponderance in the affairs of Europe. If the other powers raised objections, by partitioning Poland we secured two allies to bear the brunt of the battle, we ourselves standing in the background."

By this means we got rid of our difficulties in Poland and with Turkey. The "moderate" demands we made at Fokschan and Bucharest were objected to by France. But in spite of the rebellion of Pugatscheff, the disturbed state of Poland, and the valiant resistance of the Turks, we carried our point, "for our empire is placed under a higher protection, which foils all our enemies. In Poland we let things take their natural course; in Sweden the King was impeded by his nobility; the Turkish army was attacked and partly destroyed; the remainder with the Grand Vizier, was surrounded at the foot of the Balkan; and the Porte was forced to submit to the Treaty of Kudjac Kainardji. In order to punish the Turks, we took a large slice of territory, acquired the right of navigation on the Black Sea, and secured the independence of the Crimea, which soon fell under our beneficent protection. We at the same time took a measure that proved very useful, and to which we have repeatedly resorted since—namely, we made the Porte pay us large sums of money. Again our Empire shone in full splendour."

In the war of the Bavarian succession, the two contending parties Austria and Prussia, had to take the field by order of the Empress

* "The destruction of the Russian fleet would have raised the courage and reputation of our (the French) navy, and would probably have changed the whole fate of the war between the Russians and the Porte. This event would have restored to us the confidence, and secured the gratitude of the Turks; it would have made the Court of Vienna feel the weight of our influence, and the utility of an alliance; and it is evident that that would have prevented the whole revolution of the North."—Count de Broglie's "Policy of all the Cabinets of Europe during the Reigns of Louis XV. and XVI.," vol. ii. p. 43.

CATHERINE; and it was she who ordained the peace of Teschen by threatening to send a Russian army into Austria, if the court of Vienna hesitated to renounce its claims on Bavaria. Austria was under the necessity of purchasing a reconciliation with Russia at any price; and "soon after the Treaty of Teschen, the German Emperor had to undertake a journey to pay his court to our Empress."

Meantime, we did not lose sight of our Asiatic neighbours. The Prince of GEORGIA was induced to throw off his allegiance to the Porte. The "national work" of making war upon Turkey was resumed. "Our Empress, for this purpose, summoned (liess bescheiden) JOSEPH II. to an interview at Kherson; not because we were in need of the arms of Austria, ours being quite sufficient to annihilate the Turks, but with a view of dividing the Turkish forces, and sparing the blood of Russia. England did us no disservice in instigating the Porte to declare war against us. Austria brought two hundred thousand men into the field; but it was only in the second campaign, when she had the advantage of fighting side by side with our heroes, that she appropriated a few branches of our laurels." Pressed by the attitude of the King of PRUSSIA, Austria concluded the dishonourable peace of Sistowa, and gave back what territory she had conquered, quite to our satisfaction. Sweden managed for some time to resist us, owing to the fact that Prussia and England were impeding and thwarting the King of DENMARK, our secret ally. Being determined to make an end with Poland, we hastened the conclusion of the peace of Jassy, the more so as the French Revolution threatened to overflow all bounds. Russia had acquired five thousand seven hundred and ninety-two German square miles, being more than the whole surface of Prussia. Since that time nothing has happened in Germany independently of our control. We then found ourselves an eminently Slavonic power of the first magnitude, with an increasing force of attraction.

"It was a proof of the depth of our political conception, that we rejected all instances to join in the war against revolutionary France. A nation fanaticised for an idea which it does not comprehend is worse than a maniac; the more its energy of action is called forth by opposition, the more its irritability is enhanced, while, when that energy finds no vent, it is soon consumed and arrested. Had France been left alone, and suffered to tear her own intestines, exhaustion, and a return to a reasonable order of things would soon have followed. She would not then have found occasion for that military talent that lay dormant in the nation, and, which when once awakened, proved for a long period such a scourge to other nations; nor would the Royal Family have been destroyed. Poland being annexed, what advantages could we have drawn from a war against France, whose principles do not portend any danger to *our* empire? It is entirely against our maxims to sacrifice our heroes and our treasures for the interest of others. Our gains were five hundred German square miles on the Baltic, and eight hundred and thirty-two from Persia.

"These were satisfactory results. After the death of our great

Empress, our armies, it is true, fought against France; but then we had at least the satisfaction of seeing them cover themselves with glory, and restore in some degree the sunken spirit of the Coalition. The world witnessed the strange spectacle of professors of the orthodox Church fighting side by side with Mussulmans for the chief of the Roman Catholic Church and his oppressed children. But the whole undertaking was essentially treason against the spirit of the policy of our country; and the crime would have attained to the highest degree of atrocity if the alliance with the French Republic had been completed, and if the hostilities against England, already commenced, had been carried out. *Such a consummation was averted by the avengers of the country.*"

"The wise ALEXANDER brought things back to their natural course. So long as only republics and diminutive ones rose from the mounds of ashes and ruins, every interference on our part would have been imprudent, even though the rest of the European states had been threatened by a similar fate. In such a change we should not have been interested, except in so far as it is our task to prevent the other states, particularly those of Germany, from consolidating themselves, or entering into a firmer compact."

So soon, however, as our well-founded influence on the affairs of Europe was seriously menaced by a "*parvenu* of genius," we could not evade the struggle with that man. He girt his loins, knowing that he had not any longer to deal with Austrians. But in a murderous war our bravery could not make up for all that was wanting in our allies. The peace of Presburg is a worthy counterpart to that of Belgrade in 1739. The Cabinet of Berlin covered itself with so much disgrace that ALEXANDER called back his valiant armies; and if he entered, at a later period, into an alliance with Prussia it was simply for the purpose of taking the state of the late FREDERICK II. under his protection. "We showed to the French in 1798, 1799, 1805, and 1806, that a close combat with us is a very different affair from a fight with Germans or Italians. With forces generally inferior, we gained more victories than the French; but fools only would have made further sacrifices, which might possibly have still more endangered our position, for the sake of states like those of Germany. Our gain was Bialystock, with one hundred and fifty-eight German miles."

NAPOLEON never exercised the slightest influence on the decision arrived at by the Emperor ALEXANDER. The decrees of Berlin and Milan were quite opportune for us; Sweden, by admitting British ships into her ports, afforded us a ground for making war upon her and taking four thousand nine hundred and seventy-seven German square miles of territory. Since the loss of Finland, the state which once boasted a CHARLES XII. became powerless, a moon of the Russian sun. "We had done a good stroke of work." Soon after, we got one hundred and thirty-eight square miles from Austria. During our temporary understanding with NAPOLEON we could turn against the SHAH and the SULTAN. Having done that, we resumed our work of upsetting the *Parvenu*. It was a great advantage that a French soldier should become Crown Prince of Sweden: a man like him, a

parvenu too, was tractable; he entered into an alliance with the Conqueror of Finland, though no advantage could accrue from it to Sweden. England was made to mediate with the Porte and Persia for our benefit: the treaty of Gulistan gave us one thousand one hundred and twenty-nine square miles, and a firm footing in the Caucasus. "By the treaty of Bucharest, in 1812, we gave up, *pro tempore*, the direct superiority over Wallachia and the greater part of Moldavia, acquiring, however, at the same time, by a rectification of the frontier, the remaining part of Moldavia, together with Bessarabia, and the valuable mouths of the Danube, and thereby the control over the great artery of Austria. In addition, a protectorate, established by treaty, over those two principalities and Servia, fell to our lot, changing the old rule of the Mussulman, over those orthodox countries, into a merely nominal suzerainty."

To chastise BONAPARTE, Russia stood in no need of a severe winter; the bravery of the army and the will of the people being quite sufficient to expel the enemy. The "notorious" *Tugendbund*, in Prussia, was a seminary for revolutionary ideas; it undermined the consideration of the nobility, was strongly inclined to democratic principles, and necessitated, for that reason, a consideration on the part of Russia, although it was of some service against France. The celebrated manifesto of Wittgenstein is to be looked upon from the right point of view; it is not to be taken literally, but as a means, effective for the moment, to set the German people in motion for the well considered views and objects of the Emperor ALEXANDER.

After the general peace a wide field was opened to our diplomacy. As to Prussia, "she suffers from a military system which eats up her marrow, and from frontiers extended in the most disadvantageous manner; she maintains, but with difficulty, a place among the great Powers." Prussia must either go to pieces under some serious shock, or must avail herself of favourable circumstances to become the mistress of the whole of northern Germany. This state of things is highly favourable for our policy. Austria will require a long time to grow up into an intellectual power. Our chief aim in the work of dismemberment must be, to preserve in Italy, as well as in Germany, the existing territorial division as much as possible, and to favour, in both countries, institutions calculated to keep alive the dissension between the governing and the governed. We have prevented several mediatizings already resolved upon. The loss of Norway weakened Denmark; but the acquisition of Norway did not strengthen Sweden; on the contrary, owing to mutual jealousy, it became a drag. The arrangement suited perfectly well the interests of Russia.

The writers of the Memoir speak of the policy of England in the most contemptuous terms. During the first French Revolution, it is said to have shown the greatest imbecility; every succeeding Ministry is described as equally shortsighted and stupid. Russia owes it to the want of any serious resistance or the part of England that she could annex "convenient slices" from Turkey and Persia. "It was very fortunate that France did not understand her position. Her interest would have required her to become the natural ally of England. Not so much for the sake of France as for that of England.

England ought to have considered the BONAPARTE dynasty as a kind of necessity. Had the Cabinet of St. James concluded peace with that dynasty immediately after its establishment, NAPOLEON would have been a willing ally. Fox was almost the only English statesman who understood the situation, and saw behind the veil of the future. Fortunately, the Tories were never seriously inclined for peace, and in later times were favourable to the Holy Alliance. When at last England seemed to approach France, the old national jealousy was revived by the occupation of Algiers."*

"The Holy Alliance, propounded by Russia, was but the seal, in a pleasant form, to the dictatorship of Russia. Time will show whether the German Confederation be capable of resisting any considerable shock. If the smaller states alone had entered into a confederacy, it might have acquired some importance; it would have been a respectable ally, and strong enough to make its neutrality respected. But four of its members are European powers, preserving the right of peace and war independently. In the event of a war, with two or more of these powers arrayed against each other, the Bund is rent, and the smaller states are powerless to protect themselves by a neutrality. The war is carried into their territories, and they are forced, with or against their will, to take part." It is an imperious necessity of our policy not to allow any understanding and good feeling between princes and nations to grow up in Germany; it is, therefore, very salutary that the former are opposed to all liberal tendencies in the various Chambers. At the Congresses of Aix-la-Chapelle, Carlsbad, &c., our diplomacy acted in this sense on the German governments, and they willingly received that direction. As to France, any undue consolidation of her power was to be prevented, and we enjoyed for that end the active co-operation of the returned emigrants; faithful allies, and diligent correspondents of our Government. It was at the order of Russia that France sent an army across the Pyrenees against the Cortes. On the whole, it is our interest that there should always be in Spain a system of government opposed to that prevailing for the time being in France. Nor is the influence of England in the Peninsula to be allowed to grow too strong.

Our inheritance is the East, and we must not suffer our "activity in that quarter to relax for a single moment. WLADIMIRESCO was made to excite troubles in Wallachia; YPSILANTI did the same in Moldavia; nineteen days later the insurrection in Ajacha broke out, as arranged beforehand. Public opinion and its Greek committees assisted our plans 'in a very satisfactory manner;' the English Cabinet could not go against the popular current, and remained neutral. ALEXANDER the Glorious could foresee the fulfilment of the words which he once joyfully uttered on receipt of the news of the murder of the Patriarch of Constantinople: 'From the shores of the Bosphorus to the pillars of HERCULES the Cross shall supplant the Crescent!'" Russia provoked the Porte, and although by a happy for-

* This would require a short commentary to prevent the misapplication of the passage to altered circumstances.—*Translator.*

tune the infatuation of Europe led it to side with us, yet we left the insurgents to the furious revenge of the Turks. The responsibility for the bloodshed we laid at the door of the other powers, representing that they had prevented us from succouring the tortured Christians. Meantime, we found leisure to turn once more against Persia, and to acquire Persian Armenia, with the protectorate over her opulent trading population. Our army was kept in constant activity, as behoves an empire progressing towards such a great and sublime goal as ours.

"Our aim is, and remains, Constantinople, destined in our hands to become the centre of the world and the eternal door of Asia. For a long time England has had the supremacy of the ocean; but our maritime power will attain the same preeminence which has already been gained by our land forces. The possession of Constantinople, the Dardanelles, and the whole littoral of the Black Sea, are indispensable to us. This sea is to become one great Russian port, and the cruizing-ground of our fleets. The Emperor ALEXANDER claimed Constantinople and the Dardanelles when NAPOLEON proposed a partition of Turkey to him; at a later period, at the Congress of Verona, he himself made a like proposal to the French Cabinet. The great CATHERINE foretold, in prophetic spirit, that the execution of this grand scheme would be reserved to her second grandson. Our Hero-Emperor NICOLAS I. has taken the task upon himself. Everything of a higher order on which Mussulman life rested has disappeared, old forms and habits are upset, all higher education and activity are wanting; complete dissolution is near at hand."

Europe will try to oppose our taking possession of Turkey. Our conquest, however, advances step by step, without any considerable sacrifice on our part; it extends already to the vicinity of Stamboul. Our apparent moderation restrains even our decided enemies from taking up arms against us. Things, too, are not quite ripe yet. The acquisition, fortification, and arming of all important spots on the Black Sea is an indispensable preliminary. We have to continue our struggles with the tribes of the Caucasus: it is sometimes troublesome, but it exercises our armies and covers our preparations in the Black Sea. Our moderation in the treaty of Adrianople deprived the English Cabinet of every pretext for interference; yet we obtained everything we wanted. By fostering Egypt we contrived further to weaken Turkey. Events of the utmost importance for the splendour of our arms are not far distant. We keep the Divan in good disposition towards, and at the same time in dependence upon us. It is most essential to confirm the SULTAN in his pseudo reforms and to push him on in the same way; but it will be expedient to throw obstacles in the way of any real improvement of the military organisation. It is of equal importance that the Porte should never get clear of financial embarrassment. Above all, the uncomfortable feeling on the part of the Christian population is to be enhanced, a longing after a Christian, and, amongst our kindred Sclaves, after a Slavonic government, must be more and more stimulated, and a somewhat informal organisation established for the double purpose of preparing the general insurrection and preventing premature risings. The

chiefs of the Albanians and Bosnians may be turned to excellent account; and many things be done from within the Greek border. Any approach of Greece towards the Porte should be prevented. With the Greeks we have to keep alive, but not exactly to stimulate, the desire of aggrandisement. Persia must remain quiet; the Princes of India are to be excited against the English; and, if possible, to be brought to form a coalition against them, which must be extended at the proper time to Persia. In our southern provinces we should always keep the greatest possible amount of ammunition and provisions ready at hand. In those no foreigners should be allowed to travel. There is no occasion for haste in finishing the war in the Caucasus. Any further and decisive progress in Asia will depend upon European complications. For the present there are no prospects of weakening England materially, either in Ireland or in Canada; but in the latter province the Opposition should be assisted as much as possible. A great point would be gained by inveigling England into a conflict with the United States. In Spain our diplomacy has a wide field. LOUIS PHILIPPE should be kept suspended between soft repulse and trifling advances. Catastrophes in France are not against our interest, as they would produce profitable complications. The Legitimists are sadly in want of consolation, and should not be entirely given up; but they are to be taught to postpone any effective activity until a time when, for instance, Don CARLOS shall have carried the day. ABD-EL-KADER and the Sheriff of Morocco are not to be omitted.

Austria sinks into weakness, and is without influence in Germany, owing to her system of isolation. Viewed from abroad she appears as an inert mass, without any common instinct or impulse. This state of things should be preserved as much as possible. Above all, we have to maintain, and, at the proper time, to utilise the feelings of discontent in the Slavonic provinces. We may, in fact, regard Austria as paralysed. "In the event of a catastrophe she can be entangled in Germany and Italy, provided a suitable plan be suggested to Prussia. Her foreign policy is neither subtle nor far-seeing, but uncommonly cautious, and considerable adroitness will be required to entrap her into difficulties. Prussia can be turned to account in Germany and against France. Provided she would not oppose our plans, but maintain an armed neutrality, we might not grudge her the Main-frontier, under the condition that she would cede her Polish provinces to us. So soon as we shall have gained our ends on the Bosphorus she can do us no harm. Sweden is of little account, whether she is viewed as a possible ally or as a possible enemy; that prudent Soldier of the Revolution strives to confirm a new dynasty on an ancient throne, more by action within than without; he is, on the whole, *a persona grata* to us. In Poland, extensive conscriptions should be made, and the young levies transplanted to other provinces; the nobility, when they once make unconditional and unreserved submission, are to be treated with distinction."

"Our aim is to give the greatest possible splendour to the name of the Slaavs, to the name of Russia. The Slavonic Empire of Russia is to be raised to an eminence which shall command the world. Is that result near? Is it distant? Attained it shall, it must be."

HARVARD LAW LIBRARY

FROM THE LIBRARY
OF
RAMON DE DALMAU Y DE OLIVART
MARQUÉS DE OLIVART

RECEIVED DECEMBER 31, 1911